

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

B5

FILE:

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date:

JUL 19 2010

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a construction company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a carpenter pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2). The petition is accompanied by a corrected Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification, which is marked as corrected by the Department of Labor (DOL) as of July 23, 2007.<sup>1</sup>

The director determined that the Form ETA 750 failed to demonstrate that the job requires a professional holding an advanced degree or the equivalent of an alien of exceptional ability and, therefore, the beneficiary cannot be found qualified for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree or an alien of exceptional ability. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(4). The director denied the petition accordingly.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and timely. The procedural history in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

In pertinent part, section 203(b)(2) of the Act provides immigrant classification to members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent and whose services are sought by an employer in the United States. An advanced degree is a United States academic or professional degree or a foreign equivalent degree above the baccalaureate level. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2). The regulation further states: "A United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree followed by at least five years of progressive experience in the specialty shall be considered the equivalent of a master's degree. If a doctoral degree is customarily required by the specialty, the alien must have a United States doctorate or a foreign equivalent degree." *Id.*

Section 203(b)(2) of the Act also includes aliens "who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States." The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2) defines "exceptional ability" as "a degree of expertise significantly above that ordinarily encountered."

Here, the Form I-140 was filed on August 16, 2007. On Part 2.d. of the Form I-140, the petitioner indicated that it was filing the petition for a member of the professions holding an advanced degree or an alien of exceptional ability.

---

<sup>1</sup> The record contains the original ETA Form 750 that the petitioner submitted to the DOL. The date of receipt on the submitted ETA 750 is May 5, 2003, and the DOL correction is dated July 23, 2007. The only correction on the Form ETA appears to be a date change as to when the form was received.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal. On appeal, counsel submits a brief in which he states that a typographical error occurred on the I-140 petition, and that the petitioner intended to seek classification as a professional or skilled worker. Counsel states that USCIS should have issued an RFE prior to denying the instant petition. Counsel refers to USCIS regulations at 8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(8)(ii), (iii), and (iv).

In this case, the job offer portion of the Form ETA 750 indicates no minimum level of education required for the position and two years of experience as a carpenter, rough carpenter or carpenter assistant. Accordingly, the job offer portion of the Form ETA 750 does not require a professional holding an advanced degree or the equivalent of an alien of exceptional ability. In this matter, the appropriate remedy would be to file another petition with the proper fee and required documentation.

The AAO also notes that if all required initial evidence is not submitted with the application or petition, or does not demonstrate eligibility, USCIS, in its discretion, may deny the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8)(ii)(rule effective for all petitions filed on or after June 18, 2007). The AAO further notes that although the petitioner has established its ability to pay the proffered wage based on the beneficiary's wages as of the 2003 priority date through 2006, the record does not contain a letter of work verification to establish the beneficiary has two years of prior experience as a carpenter prior to the 2003 priority date. This documentation would also have to be submitted in any new petition

The evidence submitted does not establish that the Form ETA 750 requires a professional holding an advanced degree or the equivalent of an alien of exceptional ability, and the appeal must be dismissed.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.